

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James Edward Rose, Jr., # 21849,)	C/A No. 4:12-261-JMC-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
)	
Director Willie Bamberg,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This is a civil action filed *pro se* by a state prison inmate.¹ At the time he filed this case, Plaintiff was an inmate at the Orangeburg County Detention Center (OCDC), pending transfer to a South Carolina Department of Corrections' (SCDC) prison. According to the court's docket, he has now been transferred into SCDC custody and is incarcerated at Lieber Correctional Institution.

BACKGROUND

In the Complaint submitted in this case, Plaintiff claims that he broke his foot in three places in August 2011 while at OCDC and that surgery was ordered for him. (ECF No. 1, Compl. 3). The surgery was allegedly supposed to take place within three to five days of the break; however, according to Plaintiff, Defendant Director Bamberg refused to authorize the surgery. Plaintiff alleges that he spoke to a nurse and doctor at OCDC and was told that "it was up to the Director" when he asked them about scheduling the surgery. *Id.* He answered negatively to the question on the complaint form asking whether he filed an OCDC grievance about the alleged refusal. (ECF No. 1,

¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1), and D.S.C. Civ. R. 73.02(B)(2)(e), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such *pro se* cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e); 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

Compl. 2, § II.C.). He asks this court to order Defendant to fix his foot and to award him compensatory and punitive damages. *Id.*, Compl. 5.

INITIAL REVIEW

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint filed in this case. This review has been conducted pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leake*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *De'Lonta v. Angelone*, 330 F.3d 630, 630n.1 (4th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that this Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990). However, even under this less stringent standard, the Complaint filed in this case is subject to summary dismissal under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff's Complaint should be summarily dismissed without service on Defendant because it was filed prematurely, that is, before he fully exhausted his OCDC administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e. In enacting the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996 (the PLRA),

Congress carved out an exception to the general rule that exhaustion of state remedies is not a prerequisite to filing a civil rights suit. The PLRA amended § 1997e so that it now provides, “No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under § 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.” 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). The United States Supreme Court held that “Congress has mandated exhaustion clearly enough, regardless of the relief offered through administrative procedures.” *Booth v. Churner*, 532 U.S. 731, 741 (2001); *see Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 90-91 (2006)(prisoners must “properly exhaust” their administrative remedies before coming into court by using all steps available and doing it the way the agency’s policy requires); *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002)(exhaustion applies to all kinds of “inmate suits about prison life . . .”).

Although the lack of exhaustion of administrative remedies is generally considered an affirmative defense, and not a jurisdictional infirmity, *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 211-12 (2007), in this Circuit, if the lack of exhaustion is apparent from the face of the prisoner’s complaint or from additional facts requested by the Court, *sua sponte* dismissal prior to service of the complaint is appropriate. *See Anderson v. XYZ Corr. Health Serv.*, 407 F. 3d 674, 683 (4th Cir. 2005). In this case, Plaintiff’s failure to fully exhaust the OCDC grievance process with regard to his broken foot before filing this lawsuit is fatal to this case. His own response of “no” to the question about whether he had used the OCDC process makes that lack of administrative exhaustion clear on the face of his pleading and requires dismissal of this case without prejudice.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in this case *without prejudice*. *See Denton v. Hernandez; Neitzke v. Williams; Haines v. Kerner; Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-04 (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh; Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d at

74; *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III

Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

April 30, 2012
Florence, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).